

1 Bradley S. Keller, WSBA #10665  
2 Ralph E. Cromwell, Jr., WSBA #11784  
3 Byrnes Keller Cromwell LLP  
4 1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor  
5 Seattle, WA 98104  
6 (206) 622-2000  
7 Facsimile No.: (206) 622-2522

8 Attorneys for Perkins Coie LLP

The Honorable Frederick P. Corbit  
Chapter: 7

9 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

11 In Re:

12 GIGA WATT, INC.,

13 Debtor.

No. 18-03197-FPC7

14 **OPPOSITION TO TRUSTEE'S**  
15 **MOTION TO STRIKE**  
16 **DECLARATION OF ARMAND J.**  
17 **KORNFELD**

18 The Trustee's Motion to Strike the Declaration of Armand J. Kornfeld (ECF 980)  
19 should be denied. The Trustee confuses expert opinion for legal argument. The two  
20 are not the same. Here, Mr. Kornfeld opines, based on his training and experience, that  
21 the conduct of Perkins and its counsel in filing the Third-Party Complaint in the  
22 Trustee's adversary proceeding against Perkins was in good faith and objectively  
23 reasonable under the circumstances. *See* ECF 978 ¶ 21. Whether conduct is reasonable  
24  
25  
26

OPPOSITION TO TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO STRIKE  
DECLARATION OF ARMAND J. KORNFELD - 1

BYRNES ♦ KELLER ♦ CROMWELL LLP  
38TH FLOOR  
1000 SECOND AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104  
(206) 622-2000

1 and/or in good faith under the circumstances is an issue of fact, not law, and an expert  
2 may certainly opine, based on training, experience, and industry standards, that  
3 challenged conduct is reasonable or in good faith. *See e.g., Hangarter v. Provident Life*  
4 *& Accident Ins. Co.*, 373 F.3d 998, 1016–17 (9th Cir. 2004) (observing that “expert  
5 witness for [the defendant] was permitted to testify” to “*the issue of bad faith*” by  
6 showing that the defendant relied on both “Iowa law” and “industry practice” in  
7 engaging in challenged conduct) (quoting *Ford v. Allied Mut. Ins. Co.*, 72 F.3d 836, 841  
8 (10th Cir. 1996)).

11  
12 Moreover, Mr. Kornfeld’s expert opinion testimony that Perkins and its counsel  
13 acted in an objectively reasonable fashion under the circumstances is relevant to the  
14 Trustee’s Motion for Sanctions. Specifically, civil contempt “is a severe  
15 remedy.” *Taggart v. Lorenzen*, 139 S. Ct. 1795, 1802 (2019). Thus, the standard to  
16 impose civil contempt is high and requires a finding that there was no objectively  
17 reasonable basis for engaging in the challenged conduct:  
18  
19

20 [T]he Supreme Court has set a significantly high hurdle for when  
21 it [civil contempt] is imposed. *Taggart*, 139 S. Ct. at 1802. The  
22 standard is rooted in the concept that “basic fairness requires that  
23 those enjoined receive explicit notice of what conduct is outlawed  
24 before being held in civil contempt.” Thus, “civil contempt may be  
25 appropriate **if there is no objectively reasonable basis for**  
26 **concluding that the creditor’s conduct might be lawful.**”

1 *In re Taggart*, 980 F.3d 1340, 1347 (9th Cir. 2020) (citing *Taggart*, 139 S. Ct. at 1799-  
2 1802) (cleaned up and emphasis added). Put differently, only “when there [i]s no ‘fair  
3 ground of doubt’ as to whether the subject order barred the conduct the violator engaged  
4 in, the court has the discretion to hold the violator in contempt of court.” *In re Moo*  
5 *Jeong*, No. 6:19-BK-10728-WJ, 2020 WL 1277575, at \*4 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. Mar. 16,  
6 2020) (quoting *Taggart*, 139 S. Ct. at 1804). Critically, the “objectively reasonable”  
7 standard imposed by the Supreme Court in *Taggart* applies to civil contempt as a  
8 sanction for violating the automatic stay. *See id.*, at \*4 and n.3 (applying *Taggart*  
9 standard to civil contempt for stay violation).  
10  
11  
12

13 Therefore, Mr. Kornfeld’s declaration goes directly to a factual finding that must  
14 first be made before civil contempt can be imposed: namely, whether the alleged  
15 violator acted in an objectively reasonable fashion and there was “fair ground [to]  
16 doubt” that filing a pleading in the adversary proceeding would be improper.  
17  
18

19 Mr. Kornfeld is an extremely well-respected bankruptcy lawyer with decades of  
20 experience. He has reviewed the conduct and circumstances and, based on his training  
21 and experience, provides the opinion of an experienced practitioner that the conduct at  
22 issue was reasonable and proper. An expert opinion may embrace an ultimate issue—  
23 in this case whether filing the Third-Party Complaint was reasonable under the  
24  
25  
26

1 circumstances—and is not objectionable on that ground. Fed. R. Evid. 704(a);  
2 *Hangarter*, 373 F.3d at 1016–17 (same).  
3

4 The Trustee’s Motion to Strike Mr. Kornfeld’s Declaration should be denied.

5  
6 DATED this 19th day of January, 2023.

7 BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP

8 By /s/ Bradley S. Keller

Bradley S. Keller, WSBA #10665

9 By /s/ Ralph E. Cromwell, Jr.

10 Ralph E. Cromwell, Jr., WSBA #11784

11 1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor

12 Seattle, Washington 98104

206-622-2000

13 Fax: 206-622-2522

14 Email: bkeller@byrneskeller.com

rcromwell@byrneskeller.com

15 *Attorneys for Perkins Coie LLP*

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on this 19th day of January, 2023, I electronically filed the  
3 foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System, which in turn  
4 automatically generated a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to all parties in the case  
5 who are registered users of the CM/ECF system. The NEF for the foregoing specifically  
6 identifies recipients of electronic notice.

7 By /s/ Ralph E. Cromwell, Jr.

8 Ralph E. Cromwell, Jr.

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

10 1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor

11 Seattle, Washington 98104

12 206-622-2000

13 Fax: 206-622-2522

14 Email: rcromwell@byrneskeller.com